EISENHOWER REGIONAL MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSORTIA

Goal: To improve mathematics and science education through technical assistance and dissemination.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Consortia support Objective 1.1 (States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects), Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America), and Objective 2.3 (every eighth grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by providing standards-based professional development, technical assistance, and high-quality products in math and science.

FY 2000—$15,000,000

FY 2001—$15,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, INCLUDING PLANNING ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, FACILITATION OF COLLABORATION AND NETWORKING, AND OTHER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Indicator 1.1 Technical Assistance: At least 80 percent of participants in Consortia technical assistance activities will report that information or assistance from the Consortia added value to their work.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Training improved instructional practice			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Data reported are baseline data. Data are not available on all of the goals because this indicator was just recently revised to respond to comments in appropriations mark-up. Data on the factors other than training/professional development and collaboration will be available in 2001.	**Source:** Cross-Consortia report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Internal review procedures of Cross-Consortia evaluation committee. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Customer surveys were conducted by the Consortia. The survey response rate was 36 percent (2,070 out of 5,830 customers surveyed). Consortia data will be corroborated by a national evaluation in 2000. Future Consortia surveys will include all of the factors in the new indicator.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	91%			
1999:	**No data available**	**75%**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		
Training improved student engagement and performance				
1998:	89%			
1999:	**No data available**	**75%**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		
Collaboration strengthened relationships and access to resources				
1998:	88%			
1999:	**No data available**	**75%**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		
Collaboration leveraged resources and efforts for greater impact				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	80%			
1999:	**No data available**	**75%**		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		

OBJECTIVE 2: DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ABOUT PROMISING AND EXEMPLARY PRACTICES IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION.

Indicator 2.1 Dissemination: The total number of Consortia contacts with customers, by print or by electronic media ("hits" on Web sites plus other electronic communications), will increase by 10 percent annually, and a majority of the recipients will report that the information contributed to improving their work.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Print				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Print target exceeded. Unable to judge electronic media target or usefulness target. **Explanation:** Print contacts increased 11 percent, from 306,557 in FY 1997 to 340,185 in FY 1998. Electronic media data are incomplete because new equipment at two Consortia complicated their data collection, and they were unable to report in this category. With only 8 of 10 Consortia reporting, contacts by electronic media appear to trend away from the target, with only an 8 percent increase, from 1,354,167 in FY 1997 to 1,465,259 in FY 1998. Usefulness data are baseline data.	**Source:** Cross-Consortia Report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Internal review procedures of Cross-Consortia evaluation committee. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None for quantitative data. Customer surveys were conducted by the Consortia. The survey response rate was 36 percent (2,070 out of 5,830 customers surveyed). Consortia data will be corroborated by a national evaluation in 2000.
1997	306,557			
1998:	340,185			
1999:	**No data available**	**337,212**		
2000:		306,167		
2001:		275,551		
2002:		247,996		
Electronic Media				
1997	1,354,167			
1998:	1,465,259			
1999:	**No data available**	**1,489,583**		
2000:		1,638,541		
2001:		1,802,395		
2002:		1,982,634		
Usefulness				
1998:	70%			
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		51%		
2001:		51%		
2002:		51%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Work with the Department's initiatives leadership teams and Executive Management Council and with the National Science Foundation to develop and implement integrated plans for work in mathematics and science education.
- With the advice and guidance of their regional boards, the Consortia will set priorities for technical assistance activities in their regions and develop and implement strategic plans to identify key stakeholders and solicit their collaboration.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To further focus the mission of the Consortia, the program will develop an absolute priority consistent with the Department's strategic priorities for the FY 2000 recompetition of these grants.
- To maintain consistency of quality among the projects, the program will facilitate the integration of any new Consortia grantees into the national network of the Eisenhower Regional Consortia and National Clearinghouse.
- To support the increased use of technology and reduce dissemination costs, the program will encourage the Consortia to reduce print dissemination and increase electronic dissemination of their products and information.
- To support the Department's math initiative, the program will provide advice and technical assistance on the development and implementation of the new cross-Consortia professional development project for middle school mathematics.
- To encourage continuous improvement and more strategic planning, the program will work with the Department's Planning and Evaluation Service to supplement the national evaluation of the Consortia and provide feedback directly to the Consortia for formative evaluation.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To increase awareness of the results of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and its implications for math and science education in the United States, the program has collaborated with the Department's National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and the National Science Foundation to utilize the capacity of the Consortia to disseminate information and to train educators about TIMSS.
- To encourage the implementation of more high-quality mathematics and science curricula, the program has collaborated with the National Science Foundation and the Department's Expert Panels to use the Consortia to disseminate information about NSF-developed curricula and the Department's designated exemplary and promising mathematics programs.
- To increase the availability of high-quality professional development materials, the Consortia collaborate extensively with the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse on product development and dissemination.
- To ensure that their activities are coordinated with other Federal activities, the Consortia include representatives of mathematics and science education projects sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the National Air and Space Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency on their advisory boards and state teams.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The Department's Planning and Evaluation Service is conducting a series of national evaluations of the Consortia. The 1998 report concluded that it is incumbent on both the Department and the Consortia to continue seeking clarity about the program's mission and how well the mission is carried out, and to set appropriate expectations for the quality, scope, and impact of the Consortia's portfolios of activities and services. The 1999 report found that the Consortia continue to face the challenge of how to invest their limited resources and that they could improve their quality control processes and internal evaluation efforts. Both reports found that the Consortia continue to mature as organizations and as a Federal program. The 1999 report also found that the Consortia have achieved an impressive level of consistency between research-based definitions of high-quality professional development and technical assistance and their activities, and that the Consortia are making contributions to the improvement of mathematics and science education in their regions. The 1999 report found further that the Consortia are engaged in activities that states are less able to do and that they bring expertise to their regions that states cannot provide.
- Because the Consortia do not work directly in classrooms, it is difficult for them to demonstrate causal impact on student engagement or performance. Technical assistance is designed to impact capacity, policy, and instructional practices. Dissemination is designed to increase awareness of and access to exemplary resources.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1 and 2.1 and Objective 3 and its indicator were dropped in FY 2000 because the department wanted more concise performance plans.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

See explanation under New below.

Dropped—None.

New

- Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 were changed to respond to House Mark-Up language and to include more information from data collection conducted by the Consortia and by the national evaluation. This year's Indicator 1.1 combines last year's Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 into one technical assistance indicator because of overlap between last year's indicators.